

### **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the final Office Action of October 30, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 5-14, and 16-42 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, and 25-28 have been amended. Claims 2-4 and 15 are canceled. Claims 29-42 are newly added. The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the amendments and that a new search is not necessary.

### **CLAIMS**

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as purportedly being anticipated by Miyamoto et. al. (EP 1172224 A1), Nigam (U.S. Patent 6,291,023), or Nigam (U.S. Patent Application 20030219539) in view of Abe et. al (U.S. Patent 5,372,884) and Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent Application 20030082473), as discussed in the Office Action. Amended claim 1 reads as follows:

A print medium, comprising:  
a substrate having a fibrous component, wherein a cationic guanidine polymer compound or salt thereof and a metallic salt are each disposed within the fibrous component of the substrate, wherein ***the metallic salt is selected from sodium chloride, aluminum chloride, and magnesium chloride.***

(Emphasis added). Applicants traverse each of the 103 rejections in the Office Action and submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 by Miyamoto,

Nigam, or Nigam in view of Abe and Nakamura should be withdrawn because each, separately or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 1 above. In particular, the cited references, individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or suggest that “the metallic salt is selected from sodium chloride, aluminum chloride, and magnesium chloride” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 5-11 and 21-24**

Applicants traverse all of the 103 rejections in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that pending dependent claims 5-11 and 21-24 include every feature of independent claim 1 and that the cited references fail to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the features of claim 1. Thus, pending dependent claims 5-11 and 21-24 are also allowable over the prior art of record. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

#### **Claim 12**

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as purportedly being anticipated by Miyamoto et. al. (EP 1172224 A1), Nigam (U.S. Patent 6,291,023), or Nigam (U.S. Patent Application 20030219539) in view of Abe et. al (U.S. Patent 5,372,884) and Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent Application 20030082473), as discussed in the Office Action. Amended claim 12 reads as follows:

A method of forming print media, comprising:  
    providing a fibrous component including a plurality of fibers;  
    providing a cationic guanidine polymer compound or salt thereof and a metallic salt;  
    introducing the cationic guanidine polymer compound or salt thereof and the metallic salt to the fibrous component;

mixing the cationic guanidine polymer compound or salt thereof and the metallic salt with the fibrous component, wherein the cationic guanidine polymer compound or salt thereof and the metallic salt are disposed within the fibers of the fibrous component, wherein *the metallic salt is selected from sodium chloride, calcium nitrate, and magnesium chloride*; and

forming a substrate including the cationic guanidine polymer compound or salt thereof and the metallic salt disposed with the fibers of the fibrous component.

(Emphasis added). Applicants traverse each of the 103 rejections in the Office Action and submit that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 by Miyamoto, Nigam, or Nigam in view of Abe and Nakamura should be withdrawn because each, separately or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 12 above. In particular, the cited references, individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or suggest that “the metallic salt is selected from sodium chloride, aluminum chloride, and magnesium chloride” as recited in claim 12. Therefore, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 13-14, 16-20, and 25-28**

Applicants traverse all of the §103 rejections in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that pending dependent claims 13-14, 16-20, and 25-28 include every feature of independent claim 12 and that the cited references fail to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the features of claim 12. Thus, pending dependent claims 13-14, 16-20, and 25-28 are also allowable over the prior art of record. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

#### **New Claim 29**

Claim 29 is newly added and includes the features of claims 1 and 21, which the instant Office Action indicated is allowable. Therefore, claim 29 and claims 30-35, which depend from claim 29, are in condition for allowance.

**New Claim 36**

Claim 36 is newly added and includes the features of claims 12 and 25, which the instant Office Action indicated is allowable. Therefore, claim 36 and claims 37-42, which depend from claim 36, are in condition for allowance.


### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

In addition, any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'CBL', is written over a horizontal line.

**Christopher B. Linder, Reg. No. 47,751**